DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 365 816 CE 065 442

AUTHOR Dement, Edward F.
TITLE State Job Training Coordinating Councils. Final Report. Research Report Series.
INSTITUTION MDC, Inc., Chapel Hill, N.C.
SPONS AGENCY National Commission for Employment Policy (DOL), Washington, D.C.
REPORT NO RR-85-11
PUB DATE May 85
NOTE 36p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Adult Education; Cooperative Programs; *Coordination; Coordinators; Decision Making; *Employment Programs; Federal Legislation; Federal Programs; *Government Role; *Job Training; National Surveys; *Policy Formation; Public Agencies; *Public Policy; State Government; State Programs; Statewide Planning; Vocational Education
IDENTIFIERS Job Training Partnership Act 1982; *State Job Training Coordinating Councils

ABSTRACT

A nationwide study examined the roles, responsibilities, and major accomplishments of the State Job Training Coordinating Councils (SJTCCs) under the Job Training Partnership Act (JTPA). The 50-state assessment also documented the nature and extent of council involvement with governors, legislatures, and JTPA's local Private Industry Councils (PICs) and Service Delivery Areas (SDAs). Two-thirds of the governors continued to take an active interest in SJTCC affairs. Increasing legislative involvement with JTPA in general was indicated, but its nature and emphasis fit no consistent pattern nationally. Relations with local PICs and SDAs appeared to be consistently good. SJTCCs tended to involve themselves most heavily in JTPA-specific operational issues, while demonstrating considerably less involvement with longer-term planning and policy issues. Coordination activities and planning and allocation of state discretionary funds headed the list of current SJTCC priorities. Each state council was actively involved in some aspect of JTPA planning, coordination, or oversight. A pervasive problem was absence of mechanisms for exchanging information or comparing "best practices" among the states. The majority of SJTCCs were involved in activities that enhanced JTPA coordination with employment security agencies and public assistance programs. Councils in a half dozen states had, at their governors' urging, embarked on major new employment and training policy development initiatives. (YLB)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 365 816

Final Report

STATE JOB TRAINING COORDINATING COUNCILS

MDC, Inc.

by

Edward F. Dement

May 1985 RR-85-11

RESEARCH REPORT SERIES
NATIONAL COMMISSION
FOR EMPLOYMENT POLICY
1522 K STREET, N.W.
WASHINGTON, D.C. 20005

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

CE 065 442

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Summary Final Report

THE ROLES, RESPONSIBILITIES, AND MAJOR ACCOMPLISHMENTS OF STATE JOB TRAINING COORDINATING COUNCILS (SJTCCs) UNDER THE JOB TRAINING PARTNERSHIP ACT OF 1982

Prepared for the

National Commission for Employment Policy
Washington, D. C.

By

Edward F. Dement

MDC, Inc.
Chapel Hill, North Carolina

May 1985

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Although relatively little has been said or written about State Job Training Coordinating Councils (SJTCCs) since JTPA became operational in October 1983, this assessment found that SJTCCs are not only "up and running" in each of the 50 states, but that most of them are also playing important central roles in JTPA decisionmaking as well as devoting substantial amounts of time and energy to carrying out their statutory duties under the Job Training Partnership Act.

While SJTCCs vary considerably both in size and in levels of staffing and funding, most are meeting on a regular basis (usually bi-monthly or quarterly), and most have delegated their substantive work to various standing committees (average of four per state) which typically meet either monthly or bi-monthly. Overall, attendance by SJTCC members is holding steady in most states (although slight declines were noted by one-fifth of the councils), and business participation is generally strong. Concern was expressed, however, over low levels of attendance by local elected officials in some states, and public agency representatives in others.

Involvement of Governors and Legislatures

Two-thirds of the nation's governors have continued to take active interest in SJTCC affairs in recent months -- interest that most often manifests itself in the areas of economic development, overall coordination, education, or worker displacement. Despite the varying levels of direct gubernatorial involvement in SJTCC activities evident from state to state, the extent to which governors are now relying upon SJTCCs for JTPA decision-making is underscored by the fact that governors in 34 states have accepted all recommendations made by their councils to date, while the remaining states indicated that most of their councils' recommendations had also been accepted by governors without change. Moreover, a small but growing number of governors have assigned their SJTCCs a lead role in discussing and devising overall employment and training policy for their respective states.

There are clear indications of increasing legislative involvement with JTPA in general -- and with SJTCCs in particular -- but the nature and emphasis of that involvement fits no consistent pattern nationally. Legislators now sit on 42 state JTPA councils, legislatures in 19 states have committed some general revenues to JTPA-related programs, and 13 have conducted special studies while 13 have reviewed annual JTPA plans. Even so, only 12 SJTCC respondents nationally characterized their legislatures' involvement in JTPA as "significant," and lawmakers in nearly 40 percent of the states were said to have shown little or no interest to date. Further, while some states have clearly benefitted from cooperative JTPA efforts involving their executive and legislative branches, others indicate that JTPA administration has been complicated by disputes between the two.

SJTCC Relations with PICs and SDAs

From the state council perspective, relations with local PICs and SDAs appear to be consistently good, and in most cases have either held steady or improved in recent months. SJTCCs have used diverse means to ensure good cooperation and communication, including such practices as having all SDA directors attend council meetings, providing PICs and SDAs with permanent spots on SJTCC agendas, conducting joint meetings of SDA and SJTCC staffs, and assigning state council members as permanent liaisons to PICs and SDAs. This, in turn, has often enhanced SDA willingness to accept SJTCC policy guidance -- especially in states demonstrating commitment to creating state/local partnerships in which SDAs are an integral part of the SJTCC decision-making process.

Mandated Council Responsibilities

JTPA assigns state councils a host of responsibilities; in fact, nearly two dozen discrete tasks are subsumed under the various subparts of Sections 122(b), 122(c), and 501(d) of the Act. While this assessment found substantial variation among the states with respect to council priorities and the relative emphasis placed on various functional duties, clear patterns were evident: In general, SJTCCs have tended to involve thenselves most heavily in JTPA-specific operational issues (such as devising coordination criteria, determining how to spend discretionary funds, and devising performance measures), while demonstrating considerably less involvement to date with longer-term planning and policy issues. Nationally, coordination activities and the planning and allocation of state discretionary funds head the list of current SJTCC priorities, followed by such other tasks as establishing performance standards, reviewing operator performance, promoting state/local linkages, reviewing annual plans, and a broad range of other activities.

While few SJTCCs appear to be involved directly in executing the full range of their responsibilities under the Act, the assessment found that almost without exception, each state council is actively involved in some aspect of JTPA planning, coordination, or oversight -- and often in several areas simultaneously. Moreover, there is substantial evidence of noteworthy progress and creativity on the part of many councils and their staff support units nationally. One pervasive problem, however, is the current absence of mechanisms for exchanging information or comparing "best practices" among the states. Consequently, many SJTCC administrators -- especially those with less experience -- function in relative isolation, without benefit of knowing what has been attempted and what has been learned elsewhere. In their view, this is one area in which federal officials could explore options for assisting not only states and SJTCCs, but also the entire JTPA system.

Coordination and Policy Development

Looking specifically at state council coordination efforts involving public education, public assistance, and Employment Security (ES) agencies, it appears that the majority of SJTCCs are involved in current or recent

activities that enhance JTPA coordination with ES and with public assistance programs, while less than half see real coordinative progress proceeding between JTPA and education. And, while several states have made significant progress in all three areas of coordination -- and in some instances have keyed their efforts to the development of comprehensive state policy, as described below -- a number of them appear to have done little or nothing in recent months to tie together state and local services affecting job training, education, and employment.

Although policy development is not explicitly assigned to SJTCCs under JTPA, a growing number of councils appear to be addressing the subject recently. After having hesitated initially to enter the policymaking arena, at least two-thirds of the nations' SJTCCs have now adopted or implemented clear state policies in a wide range of JTPA-specific operational areas (e.g., the use of 6% funds, coordination with state-administered programs, and the like) and, to a lesser extent, in broad policy areas involving public agencies and services. Receiving significantly less policy attention from SJTCCs were areas often seen as falling largely into the province of local JTPA decisionmaking (such as participant support, for example, or the roles of public schools and community-based organizations).

One of the most interesting findings from this assessment, however, is that councils in a half-dozen states have, at their governors' urging, already embarked on major new employment and training policy development initiatives -- and, in so doing, have expanded their scope substantially beyond the confines of JTPA. Governors in several states have given their SJTCCs clear mandates to serve as lead oversight and policymaking bodies for all employment and training-related activities in their states. In that role, these councils are poised to exercise leadership in all matters pertaining to education and training for employment, and federal policymakers and others may find it beneficial to observe future developments in those states as work progresses.

To the extent that some states and governors are moving in the direction of establishing stronger and broader policymaking roles for State Job Training Coordinating Councils, this may also signal a growing state-level recognition both of the new opportunities states now have to influence their own employment and training policies and service delivery systems, and of the importance of states and governors assuming broader responsibility for making optimal use of limited public resources.

CONTENTS

		Page
	Executive Summary	i-iii
	Preface	v- vi
I.	Governors, Legislatures, and Relations with PICs and SDAs	1
	Involvement of Governors	1
	Legislative Involvement	2
	Relations with SDAs and Local Private Industry Councils	4
II.	Council Structure, Organization, and Operations	6
	Council Membership	6
	Standing Committees and Frequency of Meetings	7
	Council Staffing	8
	SJTCC Financial Support	9
	Recent Attendance Patterns	10
III.	Mandated SJTCC Responsibilities Under JTPA	12
	Top Priority Areas	12
	Depth of Council Involvement	12
	Relative Emphasis on Various Statutory Duties	14
	Other Observations	16
IV.	Selected Coordination Activities	17
	Overall Findings	17
	JTPA/Education Coordination	17
	ES/JTPA Coordination	19
	JTPA/Welfare Coordination	20
	Other Coordinative Activities	21
V.	SJTCC Involvement in State Policy Development	23
	General Findings	23
	Policy Positions Adopted to Date	23
	Comprehensive E&T Policy Development Initiatives	24

TABLES

1.	Extent of Gubernatorial Involvement in SJTCC Affairs	1
2.	Impact of Legislative Involvement in JTPA, by Activity	4
3.	Principal SJTCC Communications Channels with PICs and SDA	5
4.	States Reporting Significant Changes in SJTCC Membership	6
5.	Average SJTCC Voting Membership (50 States)	7
6.	Frequency of SJTCC and Standing Committee Meetings	8
7.	Levels of SJTCC Staff Support (Full-time Positions)	8
8.	Proportions of 5 Percent Grants Used for SJTCC Support	9
9.	SJTCC Attendance Patterns, August 1984 - January 1985	10
10.	Mandated SJTCC Responsibilities Identified as Being Among the Top Three Priorities of State JTPA Councils	13
11.	Relative SJTCC Emphasis on Mandated Duties under Sec. 122(b)	15
12.	Council Involvement in State JTPA Policy Development	25

PREFACE

This report, developed for the National Commission for Employment Policy by MDC, Inc., summarizes findings from a recent nationwide assessment of State Job Training Coordinating Councils (SJTCCs) under the Job Training Partnership Act of 1982 (JTPA). Previous studies -- including those conducted by MDC and Grinker, Walker & Associates as part of their ongoing independent assessment of JTPA, by the National Governors' Association, and by various other researchers -- have focused largely on the role of states and governors in administering JTPA, rather than on the activities of SJTCCs per sé. This, then, represents the first in-depth review of the role that these councils are playing in JTPA's implementation nationally.

JTPA requires the governor of each state to appoint a State Council whose purpose is to advise the governor, state legislature, local elected officials, private industry councils, service providers, and the general public with respect to a wide range of employment and training matters. While the specific duties assigned to SJTCCs (such as coordination, review of plans and performance, needs assessment, annual reporting, and the like) are enumerated in Sec. 122(b) of JTPA, all plans, recommendations, and decisions of State Councils are subject to gubernatorial approval. SJTCCs are specifically authorized to obtain such professional, technical, and clerical staff as may be necessary to carry out their functions under the Act. However, to assure that these councils provide objective oversight and management guidance, Sec. 122(a)(6) stipulates that they "shall not operate programs or provide services directly to eligible participants, but shall exist solely to plan, coordinate, and monitor the provision of such programs and services."

This 50-state assessment was designed to expand upon earlier findings concerning the organization, composition, staffing, and operations of SJTCCs, and to document the nature and extent of council involvement with governors, legislatures, and JTPA's local Private Industry Councils (PICs) and Service Delivery Areas (SDAs). Other principal aims were to determine (1) where the various State Councils stand with respect to their numerous statutory responsibilities, (2) how well they have responded to the opportunity to provide coordinative leadership in the area of education and training for employment, and (3) what progress has been made with respect to voluntary coordination efforts and policy initiatives at the state level.

In conducting this project, MDC staff and field associates held telephone discussions with key JTPA administrators and/or SJTCC directors and coordinators in each state during January and February 1985. After a preliminary review of findings, follow-up calls and brief site visits were carried out in several states where council activities appeared to be particularly interesting. In short, the purpose of this effort was to provide the National Commission, federal and state policymakers, and other interested parties with timely narrative and statistical reports on various aspects of SJTCC activity nationally, as well as brief case examples of "best practices" found in selected states. Accordingly, this document summarizes major findings in the following areas:

- o Gubernatorial and legislative involvement with State JTPA Councils;
- o SJTCC relations with local PICs and SDAs;
- o Council structure, composition, staffing and operations, and recent attendance patterns;
- o Performance of mandated council duties under Sec. 122(b) of the Act;
- o SJTCC coordination efforts with respect to education, public assistance, Employment Service, and other related programs; and
- o Council role in developing state employment and training policies, with examples of specific SJTCC accomplishments through voluntary coordination and comprehensive policy development initiatives.

Both MDC and the National Commission for Employment Policy extend their special thanks to the state JTPA administrators and council coordinators whose cooperation and assistance was essential to the successful completion of this project, and whose views largely provide the basis for this report. Findings are not intended to represent the official position of the National Commission, however, and responsibility for contents and accuracy of this document rests solely with MDC, Inc.

Finally, the author wishes to recognize MDC staff members Carol Lincoln, Sam Scott, and R. C. Smith -- and field associate Jack Walsh (San Francisco) -- for their work in gathering and analyzing data for this report; Gerri Noel of MDC, who edited and typeset the manuscript; and John Wallace of NCEP, who provided outstanding technical guidance and support throughout. Your respective contributions were both substantial and very much appreciated.

Ed Dement
MDC, Inc.

May 1985

I. Governors, Legislatures, and Relations with PICs and SDAs

To assess the nature and quality of current relations between SJTCCs and other major actors in each state's JTPA system, we asked council administrators to respond to a series of questions concerning gubernatorial and legislative involvement in SJTCC activities as well as current working relationships between the state councils and PICs and SDAs at the local level.

Involvement of Governors

According to SJTCC administrators, a majority of the nation's governors continued to be interested and involved to varying degrees in SJTCC activities at the time of this assessment. As shown in Table 1, nearly one-third of all respondents (32 percent) described their governors as being "very interested and involved personally in SJTCC affairs;" while an equal number (also 32 percent) described them as being "moderately interested and sometimes involved." While most governors tend to communicate with their SJTCCs largely or exclusively through cabinet secretaries, state agency heads, or council directors or chairs, it was noted that five had attended recent meetings or conferences sponsored by their SJTCCs.

By comparison, governors in seven states were described as "generally interested, but not involved personally," while only three were characterized as being "relatively uninterested or mostly unaware of SJTCC activities." Respondents in six states with newly-elected governors felt it was too soon to tell, and two others did not respond to the question.

TABLE 1 Extent of Gubernatorial Involvement in SJTCC Affairs (Jan-Feb 1985)

Responses	Number of Governors	Percent
Very interested and involved personally	16	32
Moderately interested and sometimes involved	16	32
Generally aware, but not involved personally	7	14
Newly-elected governor; too soon to tell	6	12
Relatively uninterested and/or mostly unaware	3	6
No response	2	4

Typically, those governors showing greatest interest in JTPA were most often concerned with issues relative to economic development (15 states) or the coordination of employment and training policies and services (13). Moreover, several states had, at their governor's urging, established special economic development teams that worked to attract new businesses or to respond to industrial layoffs and the concomitant needs of displaced workers. In at least five instances, governors have given their SJTCCs clear mandates to expand deliberations and scopes of responsibility to include not only JTPA per sé, but all other related employment and training activities in the state as well (e.g., Employment Service, vocational training, rehabilitation services, employment for welfare recipients, and the like).

As described further in Section V, councils in Florida, Indiana, Massachusetts, Ohio, and Wisconsin are now taking the lead in devising overall employment and training policy frameworks for their respective states, rather than focusing solely on JTPA.

Utilizing JTPA's resources to improve the quality of education was a top priority of eight governors, while seven others were principally interested in using JTPA to combat the problems of displaced workers. Four governors were especially concerned with serving special target groups such as women, minorities, or single heads of households, while two others had emphasized program accountability and performance standards. In the 12 states where governors had not been involved directly in SJTCC affairs, departmental or division heads of state agencies typically provided their closest like with SJTCCs, although council chairs or special assistants to the governor fulfilled that role in several instances.

Nearly half the states (24) felt their governors had been just as involved in SJTCC affairs during the early months of PY '84 as they had during the nine-month transition year, and nine others said their governors' involvement had increased during that period. Among the ten states reporting a decrease in gubernatorial involvement since mid-1984, one council director pointed out that a decline in participation was "to be expected, now that the SDAs have been established and the mechanisms for administering JTPA are in place."

Despite the variations evident from state to state, it is clear that most governors are continuing to rely heavily upon their councils for most JTPA decision-making -- and, further, that most SJTCC recommendations are being accepted by the governors. Respondents in 34 states said that all SJTCC recommendations to date have been accepted by their governors, while 14 others said the great majority of their councils' recommendations had been. (Two did not respond.) Specific council recommendations that were not accepted in full by governors most often dealt with SDA designations (six states) or with an assortment of other program or policy issues.

Legislative Involvement

State legislatures now appear to be somewhat more involved in JTPA than they were during the nine-month transition year (when the role of most was limited largely to being represented on SJTCCs), and most respondents to this assessment said they expected the trend towards increased legislative participation in JTPA decision-making to continue in the future. Even so, the levels of legislative interest and areas of principal involvement do not fit a consistent pattern, and legislative impact upon JTPA appears to have been minimal in the heavy majority of states thus far.

Although legislators hold seats as voting members of 42 SJTCCs, only 12 state council respondents (24 percent) nationally characterized the nature of legislative involvement to date as "significant." Legislatures in 19 states (38 percent) had committed some general state revenues to JTPA-related programs, 13 (26 percent) had conducted special studies of JTPA, 13 had

enacted JTPA-related statutes, and 13 had reviewed annual JTPA plans. Much of this activity, however, was concentrated in 10 states which reported legislative action in at least three of the four categories cited above. Altogether, legislatures in 19 states were viewed as having shown little or no interest in JTPA thus far, but these were generally the more rural, sparsely-populated states of the Northeast (3), Midwest (4) and West (10).

Those legislatures identified as being actively involved in JTPA were interested most often in issues pertaining to worker displacement (eight states), equitable services to target groups (three), and equitable distribution of JTPA resources to local political jurisdictions (three). Sometimes, however, legislative interest in JTPA was said to be motivated by efforts to control the use of federal funds or modify the policies and program priorities of governors, and instances of adversarial relations between governors and legislatures concerning JTPA seem to be surfacing at least as frequently as examples of cooperative, mutually supportive initiatives.[1]

Several council respondents cited legislative actions of a clearly positive nature: New York's legislature, for example, has been a prime mover for development of a comprehensive state employment and training policy. In two other instances, legislatures have been active proponents of closer working arrangements between JTPA and welfare programs (Massachusetts) and programs for dislocated workers (Rhode Island). And in Maryland, where the presiding officers of both houses of the legislature are members and active participants on the SJTCC, the governor and General Assembly have joined forces to secure state funding for three JTPA-related programs during the past two legislative sessions. These included a $2 million JTPA enrollee allowance program, a $500,000 youth work experience initiative requiring local matching funds, and a special statewide summer youth conservation program.

As shown in Table 2, legislative involvement is seen as having produced at least moderate impact on JTPA administrative procedures in 11 states (22 percent), on program services and overall JTPA policies in nine states (18 percent), and on state agency plans and governor's coordination plans in four states (8 percent). And, while three state council respondents felt that their legislatures would have greater impact within the coming year, a total of 23 (46 percent) concluded that their legislatures had caused little or no impact on any aspect of JTPA to date.

---

[1] Respondents in eight states felt that legislative involvement in JTPA had caused significant problems: In one state, the legislature placed a 10 percent cap on JTPA administrative costs; in another, the legislature had filed a court suit to determine whether it or the governor had dominant authority over JTPA. In two states, legislatures had established compliance or review procedures which complicated and prolonged normal administrative actions, and in two other states the legislatures had pressed for funding for specific programs that proved to be of poor quality. Finally, lawmakers in one Northwestern state introduced eight seperate bills in opposition to the governor's policies and overall approach to JTPA; none of them were enacted, however.

TABLE 2 Perceived Impact of Legislative Involvement in JTPA to Date, by Activity

Activity	Significant Difference	Moderate Impact	Little or No Difference	No Response
Plans of Local SDAs	2	2	43[b]	3
Plans of State Agencies	0	8	39[b]	3
Governor's Coordination Plan	0	8	40[b]	2
JTPA Programs and Services	1	8	39[b]	2
State Administrative Procedures	2	9	37[b]	2
Overall State JTPA Policies	0	9	39[b]	2
Other	1[a]	1[a]	8	40

[a]Denotes Title III program for displaced workers in each instance.

[b]Twenty-three (23) states reported "little or no difference" in all categories.

Relations with SDAs and Local Private Industry Councils

From the state council perspective, relations between SJTCCs and local PICs and SDAs have generally strengthened in recent months. Only two states indicated that relations were "less than acceptable" at the time of our calls, while 22 (44 percent) termed their state/local relationships "excellent." Commenting on trends, only one SJTCC respondent felt relations had deteriorated in recent months, while 28 (56 percent) felt they had improved and the remainder said they had held steady.

The passage of time apparently has been an important factor in the stabilization of SJTCC/SDA relations in most states: Several observers explained that initial suspicions and mistrust had been overcome by talking and working through problems together. Others noted that relations had improved after former SDA directors had been hired as SJTCC directors. Furthermore, most states have now adopted a variety of formal and informal communication channels whose basic purpose is to take SDA positions and perspectives into account in council decision-making. In Massachusetts, for example, the council's Policy and Operations committees hold two meetings per month with SDA directors statewide, and no recommendations are taken to the full council unless they are the product of prior joint decision-making.

The most direct linkage between councils and SDAs has been via appointment of SDA representatives. Of the 44 states having more than one SDA, 41 have appointed at least one local SDA representative to their SJTCCs. Fourteen states -- including one with nine SDAs and another with 15 -- had appointed one representative from each SDA to their councils. Overall, 42 percent of these SDA representatives were also chief local elected officials.

TABLE 3 Principal SJTCC Communications Channels with PICs and SDAs

Methods Utilized[a]	Number of States
Representatives of PICs and SDAs attend SJTCC meetings	21
All SDAs in state represented on SJTCC	15[b]
Regular presentations by PICs/SDAs on SJTCC agenda	14
Joint SJTCC staff meetings with all PICs and SDAs	9
Communications primarily through SDA associations	4
State JTPA staff site visits to all SDAs	3
SJTCC members assigned as liaisons to all PICs/SDAs	2

[a]Categories are not mutually exclusive; some states use more than one method.

[b]Includes only those states having two or more SDAs.

A broad range of other techniques are being used to channel SDA and PIC concerns to SJTCCs: In 21 states, SDA directors attend state council meetings regularly (and in Michigan, their travel expenses are reimbursed by the State). In 14 states, reports on SDA activities and PIC concerns are permanent agenda items for SJTCC meetings; in New Jersey, that report is given by SJTCC members who are assigned as liaisons to local SDAs. Virginia uses a somewhat similar technique under which SJTCC members are paired with local SDAs and expected to attend local PIC meetings, while Arkansas facilitates local access to the SJTCC by rotating the location of its council meetings among its nine SDAs.

Nine states now hold regular joint meetings between their councils and local PIC chairs, while several others routinely send council staff to attend meeting of SDA directors or SDA associations. In one state, SDA directors meet with council staff the day before each council meeting, thus giving local administrators the opportunity to suggest changes on proposals and policies prior to council discussion. Only two states with two or more SDAs had no identifiable mechanisms in place to incorporate PIC and SDA input; and, predictably, one of these had seen a deterioration in relations between its council and SDAs during the last six months.

Most respondents also felt that the opportunities provided for SDA/council communication had helped increase the level of SDA willingness to accept policy guidance from SJTCCs. Respondents in 33 states said most or all of their SDAs had responded positively to guidance from their councils, and seven others indicated that some of their SDAs had accepted such guidance. Only four states with multiple SDAs said that their local PICs and SDAs steadfastly maintain virtual independence from state policy guidance.

II. Council Structure, Organization, and Operations

To gain better understanding of council organization and administrative workings at the state level, the assessment also examined SJTCC composition, committee arrangements, staffing and fiscal support, administrative attachment within state government, and recent attendance patterns.

Council Membership

There has been appreciable change in some states' council membership strength and composition during JTPA's first 18 months. Based on a subsample of 40 states for which comparative figures were available,[2] it appears that minor gains or losses in membership occurred in roughly one-fourth of the states (11 of 40) during the period of January 1984 - January 1985, while more significant changes involving from five to twelve members occurred in another 20 percent of the states (8 of 40), as shown below:

TABLE 4 States Reporting Significant Changes (five or more persons) in Total SJTCC Membership, January 1984-January 1985[a]

State	Size of Initial Council	Size of Council as of Jan. '85	Change
Connecticut	44	30	-14
Wyoming	33	21	-12
Nebraska	42	21	-11
South Carolina	53	46	- 7
Louisiana	40	34	- 6
Mississippi	50	55	+ 5
New Jersey	24	30	+ 6
Delaware	30	42	+12

[a]Comparative information available only from 40 states.

While some of these shifts were attributable to gubernatorial changes, most states altered the size and/or composition of their councils for a variety of other reasons; i.e., to expand private sector representation, to eliminate inactive or uninterested members, or simply to streamline operations. Further, there has been a slight increase nationally in the number of states in which SJTCCs are administratively independent of the state agency administering JTPA: Nine states now fall in this category, and several others were contemplating such arrangements at the time of this assessment.

[2]Results from this assessment were compared with earlier figures supplied by 40 states responding to a January 1984 survey conducted by the National Governors' Association.

On average, the "typical" SJTCC now has approximately 32 members, including twelve (37 percent) from the private sector, six (18 percent) from local government, five (16 percent) from state agencies, and two (6 percent) apiece from state legislatures, CBOs, organized labor, local education agencies, and the eligible population/general public. As such, the typical SJTCC generally meets JTPA's membership requirements. These averages, however, mask the fact that there is no voting legislative membership on eight councils, no representation from the eligible population/general public in eight states, no local education representation in seven states, and no representation from community-based organizations in four states.

TABLE 5 Average SJTCC Voting Membership (50 States)

Category of Representation	Average Number	Percentage
Business and Industry	11.6	36.8
State Legislatures	2.0	6.3
State Agencies, Councils, Organizations	5.1	16.2
Local Government	5.6	17.8
Community-Based Organizations	1.8	5.7
Organized Labor	1.9	6.0
Eligible Population and General Public	2.1	6.7
Local Education Agencies	1.6	5.1
Total	31.5[a]	100.0[a]

[a]Numbers do not add precisely because of rounding.

Total SJTCC membership varies greatly, from Mississippi's high of 55 members to Montana's low of nine. Overall, 12 states now have councils with 40 members or more, 19 states have 30-39 members, ten have 20-29 members, and the remaining nine all have 19 members or less. The use of nonvoting members is not widespread (eight states), and is generally a device for securing additional state agency input. Only two states (Michigan and Virginia) appear to use nonvoting membership extensively.

Among their business representatives, 37 SJTCCs reported having one or more business members of local PICs, while 42 councils reported an average of four local elected officials among their local government representatives. Twelve (12) states reported no local PIC representation (four were statewide SDAs), while six councils included no local elected officials (three were statewide SDAs).

Standing Committees and Frequency of Meetings

In most states, it is clear that the substantive work of the councils is being done by standing committees which report and bring recommendations to the full SJTCC for final action. Overall, 45 states reported a total of 189 standing committees (an average of 4.2 per state), while five SJTCCs said they had no committees. In general, committee structure is more often

geared to JTPA functional responsibilities than to specific target groups or other topical concerns: For example, well over twice as many states had committees concerned with "planning and oversight," "coordination," and "policy development" as those with committees on particular target groups or specific program areas.

The types of standing committees mentioned most frequently included Planning (28 states), Evaluation (24), Coordination (14), Policy (12), Performance Standards (12), Statewide Programs (9), Operations (7), Youth (7), and Displaced Workers (6). In addition, 27 states reported having SJTCC Executive Committees. Thus, to the extent that committee structure can be interpreted as indicative of where council emphasis is placed, it seems to center on functional duties rather than on specific programs and client groups.

As for frequency of meetings, we found that the overwhelming majority of SJTCCs have settled into patterns of meeting either bimonthly (21) or quarterly (18). Eight states still maintain monthly schedules, while one meets semiannually and the remaining two have no regular schedule. In general, committees are somewhat more active than the full councils; Of the 45 states with standing committees, 14 said the committees met monthly, 12 bimonthly, nine quarterly, and 10 meet "as needed."

TABLE 6 Frequency of SJTCC and Standing Committee Meetings

	Monthly	Bimonthly	Quarterly	Scheduled As Needed
SJTCCs (50 states)	8	21	18	3
Committees (45 states)	14	12	9	10

Council Staffing

While the "typical" SJTCC is supported by 3.5 full-time staff positions, actual staff strength varies greatly from state to state -- from a low of ½ person in Alaska to 12½ positions in New York. Most states (28) had from 1½ to 5 positions, while far fewer (seven states) had between 5½ and 9. At the extremes, four states had one position or less, while three had 10 or more. (Eight states had no positions devoted specifically to SJTCC support). Council staff support is provided by regular state JTPA personnel in 33 states, and by self-contained, "dedicated" staff units in 15 states; two states reported a combination of the two approaches.

TABLE 7 Levels of SJTCC Staff Support (full-time positions)

	One Position or Less	1½ to 3	3½ to 5	5½ to 9	10 or More	None
Number of States	4	18	10	7	3	8

Council staff directors are most often selected by the state agency housing the SJTCC (28) or by the governor (11). By comparison, only eight were selected by the SJTCC chair (six states) or by the full council (two). Delaware is unique, however, in that its council director is furnished by one of five corporations on a rotating basis, and thus is designated by the donor corporation.

Although the issue of job tenure was not examined specifically, it appears that considerable turnover is occurring among SJTCC directors and coordinators nationally, and that perhaps as many as 35-40 percent of the individuals holding these positions have changed within the past year. Moreover, a high percentage of the newer administrators -- as well as many of their more experienced peers -- expressed strong interest in learning how their counterparts elsewhere have approached various council tasks, and in having an opportunity to discuss SJTCC duties and successful approaches with others in a national conference setting.

SJTCC Financial Support

In contrast to findings from MDC's earlier assessments, this round of calls found little remaining concern over lack of funding to support SJTCC operations. Most states now say their resources are adequate, although several observed that funds could become scarce as councils broaden their activities in the future.

Based on figures from 30 responding states, average annual funding per council was roughly $273,000 in PY '84, with actual funding levels varying substantially from state to state. At the upper end of the scale, two states (7 percent) commit $1 million or more to their councils annually, three (10 percent) provide between $500,000 and $1 million, and six (20 percent) devote between $250,000 and $499,000. At the lower end, 14 states (47 percent) commit from $100,000 to $249,000, four (13 percent) budget between $50,000 and $99,000, and one (3 percent) operates on less than $50,000 annually. (Twenty states either had no separate council budgets, or else could account only for travel, per diem, and related costs associated with council meetings.)

In terms of the proportion of "5 percent" administrative grant funds devoted to SJTCC operations in the same 30 states, three-fourths (22) of them spent less than 40 percent of their PY '84 administrative setasides for council support, while four spent between 40 and 69 percent and four others said they spent 70 percent or more. Nationally, over half the responding states (17) spent less than one-fifth of their "5 percent" state setasides for SJTCC support purposes.

TABLE 8 Proportion of "5 Percent" Grant Used for SJTCC Support (PY '84)[a]

	0-9%	10-19%	20-39%	40-69%	70-89%	90% or More
Number of States (30)	6	11	5	4	2	2

[a] Information was not available from 20 states.

Nationally, only 12 (24 percent) of the 50 states said that available funds were inadequate for SJTCC support purposes, and most of these attributed the problem to JTPA's overall lack of adequate funding. One small state complained that its limited population base and consequent lack of JTPA funds created major problems in terms of handling audits, administration, and SJTCC activities from its 5 percent grant. Two states cited severe staff reductions stemming from insufficient SJTCC funding, while another indicated that its governor's expectations for the council simply could not be met within the constraints of present funding.

Recent SJTCC Attendance Patterns

To ascertain the attendance records of major interests represented on SJTCCs, we asked respondents to estimate average percentages of members from each group attending the last three full council meetings prior to this assessment. Overall, business members have shown strongest attendance in recent meetings, averaging 70 percent or better in 36 states and 50 percent or less only in four instances. Local government representatives also participated regularly, with 30 states reporting their average attendance at 70 percent or better, seven reporting an even 50 percent, and only five reporting 45 percent or below. State agencies, by comparison, attended at rates of 70 percent or better in 29 states, 50 percent in four states, and 45 percent or below in six instances.[3]

TABLE 9 SJTCC Attendance Patterns, August 1984 - January 1985

Membership Sector	90% or More	70-89%	50-69%	Under 50%	INA
Business and Industry	10	26	10	3	1
State Agency Appointees	14	15	12	6	3
Local Elected Officials	8	22	11	7	2

Across all categories of representation, six states said total attendance of voting members had been increasing during the last half of calendar 1984, 33 said it had been holding steady, and 11 indicated that attendance had been declining (only one called the decline "substantial").

[3] The rates reported for appointed agency representatives may be misleading, however, since 21 states report that agency members routinely send "designees" to represent them in SJTCC deliberations. Some respondents said this practice had improved council meetings because the designees were often more knowledgeable than the official appointees. Others reported, however, that the habitual absence of appointed agency members caused problems at council meetings -- especially among business members who found the agencies' lack of attendance and interest to be an "annoying" source of ill will, hesitancy, and impaired morale among other voting members of the councils.

As for business participation, seven pointed to increasing attendance at recent meetings, 36 said rates had remained steady, and seven reported declines during the preceding six months.

On balance, it appears that SJTCC attendance is fairly strong in most states, and is particularly good on the part of business representatives. Concerns expressed in prior rounds of calls regarding the perceived erosion of business involvement have now subsided in all but a handful of instances and, if anything, there is now greater concern over nonparticipation by local elected officials in some states, or by legislators and appointed agency representatives in others. Several states offered advice on how to boost council attendance: Mississippi, whose council enjoys 90 percent attendance or better from each group, attributes its success to a strong committee system in which every SJTCC member has a specific assignment. There, each of the SJTCC's five committees reports to the full council at every meeting, thus giving each council member a vested interest in attending.

III. Mandated SJTCC Responsibilities Under JTPA

Section 122(b) of JTPA specifies a host of statutory duties for SJTCCs. To ascertain where councils have generally placed greatest emphasis, each respondent was asked to (1) identify the top three current priority items for their council, (2) rank numerically the extent of their council's involvement in selected areas of mandated responsibility, and (3) indicate whether SJTCC involvement in each specific area had been heavy, moderate, or weak relative to all others.

While this approach was far from being scientifically precise and statistically pure, it did yield quantifiable results and new insights on where the majority of councils are presently devoting the bulk of their attention (and, conversely, on which among the various mandated duties have received only scant attention to date.)

Top Priority Areas

Among the "top priorities" cited by the various state council respondents, the subject mentioned most frequently, by far, was that of overall coordination (e.g., state coordination criteria, Governors' Coordination and Special Services Plans, and the like) -- listed among the top three priorities of 35 councils (70 percent) -- followed by the planning and/or allocation of state setasides in 23 states (46 percent), and various aspects of establishing and implementing performance standards in 11 states (22 percent).

As shown in Table 10, other topics receiving mention by four or more states included: Review and comment on JTPA operator performance (9); state/local coordination and linkages with local PICs (8); reviewing plans of SDAs and service deliverers (7); economic development/JTPA coordination (6); identifying overall employment and training and vocational education needs (6); ES/JTPA coordination (4); and reviewing plans of state agencies (4). While numerous other responses were provided, none was cited by more than three states.

Depth of Council Involvement

Substantial variation was found among the states in terms of depth of SJTCC involvement in the broad range of duties under Section 122(b) of JTPA. Overall, it is clear that coordination issues (including coordination criteria, GCSSPs, and state/local relations), determining the uses of state "setasides" (especially the 8% and 6% grants), and interagency linkages are getting consistently heaviest attention, while overall needs assessments, review of state agency plans, performance evaluation, issuance of special reports and recommendations, and optional responsibilities for WIN and ES are consistently getting the least.

TABLE 10 Mandated SJTCC Responsibilities Identified as Being Among the Top Three Priorities of State JTPA Councils

Mandated Responsibility or Activity[a]	Number of States Citing as Priority Area
Overall Coordination (GCSSPs, coordination criteria, etc.)	35
Allocation of non-formula resources (state setasides)	23
Adopting and modifying performance standards	11
Review and comment on JTPA operator performance (oversight)	9
State/local coordination and PIC/SDA relations	8
Reviewing plans of SDAs and local service deliverers	7
Identifying state E&T and vocational education needs[c]	6
Economic development linkages with JTPA	6
ES/JTPA coordination	4
Reviewing JTPA-related plans of state agencies	4
Evaluation of E&T programs[c]	3
Providing management guidance to SDAs	3
Promoting programs and services for older workers	3
Providing overall planning and policy guidance	3
Providing recommendations to governors and state legislatures	2
Programs and Services for displaced workers	2
Development of comprehensive E&T delivery systems[b,c]	2
Marketing JTPA[b]	2
Designation of SDAs	1
PIC certification	1
Assessing the adequacy of services to women and minorities	1
Developing welfare employment policy[b]	1
Planning and implementing support systems (LMI and T/A)[b]	1
Reorganizing the SJTCC[b]	1
"Getting programs up and running"[b]	1
"Setting the time and place of each successive council meeting"[b]	1

[a] Responsibilities as defined under JTPA Sec. 122(b).

[b] Denotes activities not specifically mandated under JTPA.

[c] To conserve space, the term "employment and training" is abbreviated as "E&T" in the chart above and in the remainder of the text.

Considering the sixteen topical areas in which respondents were asked to rate council involvement on a four-point scale (with a maximum of 200 points possible for heavy SJTCC involvement in decision-making in all 50 states), the following scores and rankings were obtained:

		Points
1)	Developing and recommending the GCSSP	153.0
2)	Planning the allocation of 6% incentive and T/A grants	141.5
3)	Coordinating state JTPA activities with local PICs	135.0
4)	Planning the allocation of 8% education coordination grants	134.0
5)	Recommending variations in performance standards	130.0
6)	Developing linkages with other E&T-related programs	126.0
7)	Reviewing and commenting on annual ES plans	121.0
8)	Planning the allocation of 3% older workers' grants	119.0
9)	Providing management guidance and review of all E&T programs	100.5
10)	Identifying overall E&T and vocational education needs	96.5
11)	Reviewing plans of all state agencies	86.5
12)	Providing comments and recommendations to governors, legislators	85.5
13)	Planning the use of 5% state administrative grants	65.5
14)	Planning the uses of ES 10% discretionary grants	64.0
15)	Assuming the WIN coordination function (optional)	22.0
16)	Assuming the ES state advisory council role (optional)	19.0

Relative Emphasis on Various Statutory Duties

When respondents were asked to rate their council's emphasis on specific subjects as being "heavy," moderate," or "weak" relative to all other activities, a similar pattern emerged. Among the items cited most frequently as receiving relatively heavy council emphasis were the following: Developing and recommending the GCSSP (36 states); advising the governor and local entities on the adequacy and consistency of job training plans (32); coordinating state JTPA activities with local PICs (29); recommending variations in performance standards (26); developing appropriate linkages with other E&T-related programs (26); planning the 6% incentive and T/A grants (26); planning the 8% education coordination grants (23); planning the 3% older workers' grants (20); and providing management guidance and review for all E&T programs in the state (20).

Those areas in which the greatest proportion of responding states said they placed moderate emphasis included: Reviewing and commenting on annual ES plans (28); identifying the overall E&T and voc-ed needs of the state (25); making an annual report to the governor and issuing other studies as advisable (24); reviewing the plans of all state agencies providing E&T-related services (23); assessing the extent to which programs and services represent a consistent and coordinated approach to meeting state needs (22); and reviewing the operation of programs in each SDA and the adequacy and responsiveness of state services (19).

Finally, those statutory duties most often receiving relatively weak emphasis from SJTCCs nationally included: Planning the use of 5% administrative grants (27); assuming the functions of the State ES advisory

TABLE 11 Relative SJTCC Emphasis on Mandated Duties Under Sec. 122(b)

Rank	Statutory Responsibility or Activity	Total Points[a]
1	o Developing and recommending the GCSSP	134.0
2	o Advising the governor and local entities on job training plans, and certifying their consistency with GCSSPS	128.0
3	o Coordinating state JTPA activities with local PICs	120.0
4	o Developing linkages with other E&T-related programs	120.0
5	o Planning the allocation of 6% incentive and T/A grants	118.5
6	o Planning the allocation of 8% education coordination grants	114.5
7	o Recommending variations in JTPA performance standards	112.5
8	o Reviewing and commenting on annual State ES plans	109.0
9	o Providing management guidance and review for all E&T programs in the state	105.0
10	o Making an annual report to the governor and issuing other such studies and documents as advisable	102.5
11	o Planning the allocation of 3% grants for older workers	101.0
12	o Identifying the state's E&T and voc-ed needs	100.0
13	o Assessing the extent to which federal, state, and local E&T programs are consistent and coordinated	99.0
14	o Reviewing the operation of SDA programs and the adequacy and availability of state services	93.0
15	o Reviewing the E&T plans of all state agencies	92.0
16	o Providing comments to governors, legislatures, and others on the relevance and effectiveness of delivery systems	91.0
17	o Commenting at least once annually on state voc-ed plans	86.0
18	o Recommending various ways to improve the effectiveness of local operations and state services	81.0
19	o Planning the allocation of 10% ES discretionary grants	80.5
20	o Planning the usage of 5% state JTPA administrative grants	77.0
21	o (Optional) Assuming the functions of ES advisory councils established under the Wagner-Peyser Act	41.0
22	o (Optional) Assuming the functions of the state WIN program coordinating committee	39.0

[a] Responses were scored on a three-point scale -- that is, a topic cited as receiving "heavy" emphasis from SJTCCs in all 50 states would have rated a maximum possible score of 150 points.

council, an optional activity (26); planning the use of ES 10% discretionary funds (24); assuming the functions of the State WIN coordinating committee, also optional (22); recommending various ways to improve the effectiveness of local operations and state services (22); and providing comments to the governor, legislature, and others on the relevance and effectiveness of E&T and related service delivery systems (19).

A numerical ranking of responses in all mandated areas of council activity is shown in Table 11, and tends to confirm the general patterns described above.

Other Observations

While our assessment indicates that relatively few SJTCCs are involved heavily in the full range of responsibilities listed under Section 122(b) of JTPA, one significant finding is that almost without exception, each state council is indeed enthusiastically involved in some aspect of JTPA -- and has focused considerable attention and energy on one or more statutory duties determined by the council to be of particular significance in its state. Moreover, one non-mandated activity that is clearly being emphasized by many councils is that of statewide JTPA marketing and public relations.

Finally, the assessment uncovered numerous "exemplary approaches" deserving of further study, documentation, and dissemination to other interested states and councils, and some of these are cited in Part II of this report. One pervasive problem, however, is that mechanisms for exchange of information and ideas or comparison of approaches among the various states do not exist presently. And, as a result, many council administrators -- particularly those with less experience -- indicate that they often feel as though they must function in isolation, without benefit of knowing what has been attempted and what was learned in other states. There is strong sentiment on the part of state council respondents for finding some workable means of facilitating this exchange of ideas and approaches among councils and their staff units nationally.

IV. Selected Coordination Activities

To assess the nature and extent of specific council coordination activities occurring in the six months preceding this study, we asked respondents to briefly summarize their councils' recent initiatives involving JTPA coordination with public education, State Employment Security Agencies, public assistance programs, and a variety of other initiatives. Readers should note that the findings presented below do not constitute the "whole story" with respect to SJTCC coordination activities during JTPA's first 18 months, but focus instead on examing where SJTCCs have tended to concentrate their attention and energies most recently.

Overall Findings

Results of this assessment generally reaffirm the findings from MDC's last 50-state survey (June-July, 1984), when a considerable level of coordinative activity was being reported between JTPA and the Employment Service at both the state and local levels. The January 1985 assessment suggests that coordination between JTPA and ES -- and between JTPA and welfare programs -- is proceeding at a steady pace, while coordination between JTPA and education agencies may be lagging somewhat. Nationally, 36 states (72 percent) reported recent progress with respect to ES/JTPA coordination, while 29 state council respondents (58 percent) said much the same about JTPA/welfare activity. By comparison, 28 states (56 percent) saw little real coordination proceeding between JTPA and education in recent months, either on the state or local level.

These numbers may, however, be in themselves deceptive: As noted above, coordination activities occurring before mid-1984 were not asked about; and, moreover, some respondents noted that their councils are presently studying new means of coordination in the areas in question, but have not yet taken specific actions. This may be particularly true in the education area, where recent passage of the Carl Perkins Vocational Education Act of 1984 has sparked a new interest on the part of some SJTCCs. "A very hot topic," one respondent noted. "The council has had briefings on the new voc-ed act and will probably develop recommendations later this year, but is still learning about the new law right now."

JTPA/Education Coordination

In the previous section, we noted that councils generally have shown heavy interest in determining the uses of 8% education coordination funds, but this apparently has not yet carried over into substantive coordination efforts involving education and JTPA. Indeed, in commenting on JTPA/Education coordination, most respondents referred to the fact that their councils played roles of varying intensity in reviewing plans for the use of 8 percent money, whether by some state educational agency or by the local SDAs. Only a handful used the review process to actually effect closer JTPA coordination with education agencies, however, and only one reported mingling state general revenues with JTPA 8 percent funds for purposes of conducting an education demonstration program.

A sampling of findings from those states reporting some of the more substantial education coordination activities now underway includes the following:

- In California, interagency coordination agreements have been signed (or negotiations are underway) both between state JTPA and education agencies and between SDAs and local education agencies.

- In Colorado, a council Task Force on Coordination is working to bring about greater coordination between education and JTPA at both the state and local levels.

- In Georgia, the SJTCC has revamped the use of 8 percent funds at the local level, and has called for more PIC involvement in education coordination decision-making.

- In Maryland (where the legislature has enacted a state-funded work experience program for in-school youth), the SJTCC has launched a formal study of secondary and post-secondary voc-ed articulation, and has also created a special interagency education coordination review panel as a council subcommittee.

- Massachusetts has formed a state Youth Council to function as a subcommittee of its SJTCC, and has committed $250,000 in state education funds to match a similar amount from its 8 percent grant in order to launch local demonstration projects.

- In Michigan, a staff member of the state education department is now outstationed with the SJTCC to assist in coordinating the use of 8 percent education funds.

- Texas reports a significant change this year in the use of 8 percent funds, which will now be used for demonstrations rather than for formula-funded activity. Also, JTPA staff and council members have been involved in the state's education reform attacks on functional illiteracy and the statewide school dropout problem.

- In Vermont, the SJTCC and the State Department of Education have worked closely on the development of an in-school work experience program to be run by the state education department.

- In Virginia, the SJTCC has signed a cooperative agreement with the State Board of Education, which in turn has initiated a requirement for voc-ed agencies to share their plans with local PICs. The council's aim is to bring voc-ed advisory boards and local PICs closer together, and PICs are already empowered to comment on the voc-ed system's solicitation process.

ES/JTPA Coordination

Recent progress toward improved coordination seemed easiest to trace with regard to the Employment Service. Overall, 19 councils (38 percent) reported significant ES/JTPA coordinative action beyond the stage of plan review. In Florida, for instance, the governor and SJTCC have given the state staff power to integrate ES functions wholly inside JTPA; and, to this end, the council has established special performance standards and receives quarterly reports on ES progress in the areas of applicant services, managerial activity, and employer outreach. This "state-down" coordination also shows up elsewhere, most notably in Colorado, Delaware, Montana, and Wisconsin, among others. In several states, however, the councils' coordinative efforts seem geared more specifically to the PICs, SDAs, and the local ES offices, as they were in Georgia and Ohio.

Beyond the 19 councils reporting significant action on ES/JTPA coordination in the past six months, four others reported progress in general ES coordination and 11 others had devised some systematic means of reviewing ES planning. Co-location of ES and JTPA offices was also occurring -- or was planned to occur -- in New Jersey, Nebraska, and Maryland. Among the illustrative examples found:

- Colorado reports that it has established "true joint planning guidelines," with oversight provided by a Public Caucus of the SJTCC, chaired by the head of the state's ES agency.

- Delaware has recently combined its ES and JTPA units within the same state agency.

- In Georgia, local ES plans are developed by local task forces which include both ES and SDA staff, PIC members, and local elected officials.

- In Kansas, the state's entire ES 10% discretionary grant is being used in conjunction with JTPA Title III programs to put ES staff in the field to support "quick-response" teams working on plant closures and worker displacement.

- In Kentucky, where ES is the state's administrative agent for JTPA, the SJTCC has committed ES 10% funds in support of JTPA at the local level.

- Maryland's SJTCC commissioned an independent study of ES as a prelude to making recommendations on improving Job Service operations; currently, the state is also experimenting with co-location of ES and JTPA staff units at the local level.

- In Massachusetts, the SJTCC has cast local PICs in the role of boards of directors of local ES operations; PICs are now reviewing ES assignments and performance statewide.

- New Jersey is moving to integrate JTPA and ES statewide, using co-terminous boundaries, co-located staff units, and other similar means.

- In Wisconsin, SJTCC and state ES staff jointly developed an exemplary new format for joint ES/JTPA planning at the state and local levels. The state's new planning document lays out the scope of activity required, the responsibilities of actors at all levels, and presents a rigorous 19-step plan and timetable for implementation.

Overall, our impression is that considerable movement is continuing to occur in the ES/JTPA coordination area nationally. Altogether, only 10 states reported having done nothing in this area in the six months preceding our assessment.

JTPA/Welfare Coordination

Coordination involving JTPA and welfare agencies fell somewhere between the limited progress made in education and the more substantial progress noted with respect to ES -- that is, it was spotty, but not inconsiderable. Nationally, 29 councils reported some degree of progress on the welfare linkages front, from very general state-level planning coordination in several states to overall joint state and local coordinative agreements in California, New Mexico, and Pennsylvania.

Several interesting coordination ideas turned up in this area: In Georgia, recruitment messages including JTPA telephone numbers are printed on food stamps, while North Carolina includes JTPA "stuffers" in its mailings of welfare checks. And in New Hampshire, welfare workers carry with them "tickets for training" which can be given to clients and later redeemed for JTPA employment and training services. Other interesting examples in this area include:

- Delaware is stressing remedial education and job search assistance for welfare recipients, who represent 50% of the state's JTPA adult enrollment goal.

- Indiana's SJTCC is examining recommendations from a special Task Force which proposed changes in state operations to improve JTPA/WIN coordination and to eliminate disincentives for welfare clients to continue training or move into jobs.

- Maryland's SJTCC has endorsed a plan whereby state WIN funds are used to provide JTPA support for enrollees who are WIN-eligible; moreover, the chair of the council's Task Force on Public Assistance sits on the program approval board of the state's Department of Human Resources, thus ensuring coordination of program services.

- Massachusetts has major initiatives underway, with $1.6 million in state revenues tied to JTPA services for adult education and ESL; in addition, $1 million in state funds is committed to JTPA for assessment of welfare recipients, and $200,000 in JTPA 6% funds was dispensed to several SDAs as incentives for serving welfare recipients (who represent 38-39% of all JTPA participants in the state).

- The New York SJTCC staff has developed a series of position papers which review the effectiveness and make recommendations on a variety of welfare initiatives including grant diversion, day care, and other topics.

- In Texas, several demonstration programs involving welfare grant diversion are now underway, with JTPA staff evaluating results at the state level.

- Utah's SJTCC is sponsoring an initiative to link the state's Self-Sufficiency Program with JTPA statewide; an $800,000 appropriation was also obtained from the legislature to train the state's welfare recipients.

Other Coordinative Activities

Progress in other coordinative areas was also reported -- most notably, between councils and SDAs, between JTPA and economic development, with Title III programs for displaced workers, and with a variety of agencies serving special populations. To illustrate the diversity of these efforts, the Arizona council has prepared a handbook to be used in monitoring and evaluating the extent to which SDAs are coordinating local programs with major state agencies, while the Connecticut SJTCC is focusing on state-level coordination in five program areas. Councils in Hawaii, Kentucky, and Minnesota have been involved heavily in Title III coordination, while Alaska and Louisiana have emphasized PIC coordination. And New Hampshire has launched a concentrated services program that identifies families receiving public support and mobilizes a variety of services on their behalf, while North Carolina has created a special, state-level coordinating committee whose purpose is to identify local coordination problems and involve various state agencies in devising appropriate solutions.

By far, however, the single most-talked-about topic was that of JTPA coordination with economic development. Even though efforts in many states have yet to progress beyond the "talking stage," we did find several examples deserving mention here as well as further documentation for consideration by other interested states and SJTCCs. Thes include, for example:

- Delaware, which has heightened interest and involvement in JTPA through enactment of its Blue Collar Jobs Act. The Act institutes a 0.1% state assessment on UI payroll taxes, which will provide $1.6 million annually to finance new job training activities. Proceeds are divided on a 75/25 basis between the Delaware PIC and the state economic development agency; and, of the 75% going to the PIC, 50% is to be used for school-to-work transition services while the remainder is to be used for displaced worker training and innovative programs of the PIC's choosing.

- Florida, where the SJTCC is presently working on a coordinative plan for state economic development.

- Nevada, where links have been established between state economic developers and SDAs to work with businesses relocating in the state or considering expansions.

- New York, where a portion of jobs created by industries using Industrial Revenue Bonds (IRBs) are now set aside specifically for JTPA eligibles.

- Rhode Island, where all SDAs are on a team with state economic development staff to work with companies predicting layoffs or closure. The state has had an excellent Title III program (all funds spent), largely because of this state/local teamwork.

- Virginia, where the council has made a state university's 10-week extension course on economic development available to PIC members and SDA staff statewide. JTPA provides fellowships, and the program has produced better understanding of economic development principles and means of coordinating JTPA with a range of local economic development activities previously inaccessible to the SDAs.

V. SJTCC Involvement in State Policy Development

While policy development is not specifically required of state JTPA councils, opportunities to formulate state policy positions are inherent in many of the statutory duties assigned to SJTCCs. Moreover, some observers suggest that the area of policy development may constitute the single most readily-available means by which councils can exert lasting influence on JTPA and related programs at both the state and local levels. Consequently, we asked council administrators both to summarize their efforts toward policy development generally, and to describe specific state policies their councils had devised in a variety of program areas.

General Findings

Early on, most councils were hesitant to establish binding, statewide policies under JTPA -- partly out of hesitancy to impose themselves on local PICs and SDAs and partly because the press of other JTPA business precluded any concerted emphasis on the policy development. It appears that a growing number of SJTCCs have begun to address the issue in recent months, however, and several governors have now designated their SJTCCs as lead agents for developing overall state employment and training policy. As described below, these councils now have broad mandates to function as chief state policy-makers for a broad range of programs including ES, voc-ed, vocational rehabilitation, welfare training, and economic development, in addition to JTPA. Thus these fledgling "supercouncils" may be ideally positioned to begin evolving significant overall employment and training policy in their states, and their progress should continue to be observed as work proceeds.

Policy Positions Adopted to Date

Based on respondent's comments, a substantial proportion of councils nationally (easily 60-65 percent) have now approved and/or implemented clear state policies in from four to seven of the 13 topical areas included in this assessment. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of those not yet having approved such policies had at least discussed doing so, and many of these were already involved in drafting and formulating new policy positions.

Clearly, there is substantial variation in both the nature and extent of policy development among states. For example, Connecticut requires review of local JTPA plans by economic development agencies, while Alabama has used state JTPA funds to hire substate regional staff for linkage-building purposes. Similarly, several states have adopted policies requiring simple "coordination between JTPA's Title II-A and Title III programs," while others have gone farther by specifying who does what with whom, and what program outline must be followed for each locality receiving Title III funds.

In terms of total numbers of states indicating the adoption or implementation of specific policies in selected areas, the following pattern emerges:

Policy Area	Number of States
o Incentives and T/A to local SDAs (6% grants)	36
o Coordination with JTPA Title III programs	33
o Statewide priority target groups	33
o JTPA linkages with WIN and welfare-related programs	23
o JTPA linkages with economic development activities	22
o Role of State ES in JTPA service delivery	21
o JTPA links with post-secondary vocational education	21
o Role of other state agencies in JTPA service delivery	19
o Support services to be provided to JTPA participants	15
o JTPA allowances or needs-based payments	14
o Links with secondary school voc-ed programs	14
o Role of secondary public schools in JTPA	11
o Role of CBOs in JTPA planning and service delivery	11

Overall, it appears that councils have been most active in those areas involving or requiring JTPA-specific operational decisions (e.g., use of 6% money, Title III coordination, and statewide priority groups), and somewhat less active in policy areas involving state agencies and services such as welfare, economic development, post-secondary education, and the like. Receiving significantly less policy attention from SJTCCs were several topics generally perceived as falling in the realm of local decision-making (such as support services and allowances, links and secondary schools, and roles of community-based organizations). Table 12 depicts the extent of SJTCC involvement in selected areas of JTPA policy development nationally.

There was also predictable variation in levels of effort and intensity among the states: At one extreme, 18 states had adopted or implemented policy positions in seven or more of the 13 areas sampled. At the other, at least 11 had not attempted to engage in policy development to any significant degree. In this latter group of states, six had adopted policies in only two of the 13 subjects examined, two states had done so in just one area, and two said they had not yet adopted any policies in the areas discussed. Finally, Oregon's governor and council provided something of a unique example, operating from the basic premise that JTPA policymaking would be left to the SDAs -- a position that has drawn considerable opposition from a state legislature that would clearly prefer a stronger state policy role.

Comprehensive E&T Policy Development Initiatives

As noted previously, SJTCCs in at least five or six states have, at the urging of their governors, already embarked on major employment and training policy development initiatives; and, in doing so, several have assumed roles that transcend the strict confines of JTPA. While work is still in early stages in most cases, it is apparent that these councils are moving in the direction of becoming focal points for all major E&T-related policy decisions in their states, and thus are breaking significant new ground in the process.

TABLE 12 Council Involvement in Statewide JTPA Policy Development (Feb. 1985)

Policy Area	No Action to Date	Discussion Only	Policy Drafted	Policy Adopted	Policy Implemented
o Linkages with economic development and/or industrial recruitment activities	3	21	1	7	18
o Role of State ES within the statewide JTPA delivery system	3	24	1	4	18
o Linkages with WIN and other welfare-related programs	8	18	1	9	14
o Role of public secondary schools in JTPA service delivery	14	23	2	4	7
o Links with vocational education:					
-- Secondary Level	6	20	10	2	12
-- Post-secondary level	5	18	6	5	16
o Role of other state agencies in JTPA planning or service delivery	6	23	2	7	12
o Role of local CBOs in JTPA planning or service delivery	16	22	1	4	7
o Support services to be provided to eligible JTPA participants	14	21	0	3	12
o JTPA allowances and/or needs-based payments to participants	17	19	0	1	13
o Coordination with JTPA Title III programs for dislocated workers	4	10	2	10	24
o Incentives and technical assistance to local SDAs	7	4	3	14	22
o Special statewide target groups or client service priorities	7	10	0	9	24

In Florida, for example, the SJTCC is presently trying to pull together a state employment policy framework involving all other appropriate agencies, an important feature of which is that anything having to do with employment and training would have to go through the state's local PICs and be included in their plans before being approved at the state level. Indiana's council, which has already adopted statewide JTPA policies in nine of the 13 areas surveyed, has forgone involvement in JTPA administrative details in favor of assuming the role of chief policy advisor to the governor on a range of issues. There, the council seems determined to remain broad-based and to focus on JTPA only to the extent that its resources can be used to support overall employment and training, vocational education, or economic development initiatives throughout the state.

Massachusetts, whose initial council got off to a slow start and was subsequently restructured, is now concentrating heavily on policy development, including efforts to create a comprehensive delivery system called MASS JOBS -- a one-stop service approach providing access to the entire E&T system. In recent months, another major effort has been launched using private funds to convene key cabinet secretaries and high-level business leaders to plan and develop an Employment Policy for the Commonwealth, beginning with a review of "best practices" from other nations (i.e., program models, methods of financing, and results). At the time of our calls, the SJTCC chairman was scheduled to meet with the governor to lay out the basic framework of this proposed policy.

While Ohio's SJTCC has not been engaged heavily in policy development until now, this is clearly the direction in which they are moving, according to staff. There, the governor is using the state's JTPA administrative agency (also the state's ES agency) to leverage coordination from other agencies, and has put that agency and its SJTCC in the role of doing strategic planning for the state's entire E&T system, not strictly JTPA. And Maryland's SJTCC expects to accelerate its already-active involvement in comprehensive policymaking when it becomes attached administratively to the governor's office in July of this year.

Finally, Wisconsin's state JTPA council was recently handed a gubernatorial mandate to become a "council among councils" by serving as the lead oversight and advisory group for all E&T-related activities in the state. Under an Executive Order issued in January 1985, the council was transferred to the State Department of Labor, Industry, and Human Relations, given an independent staff, and directed (along with the Secretary of that department) to exercise leadership in all matters pertaining to employment and training — specifically, "to develop a consistent policy framework for coordinated state E&T programs, including the programs of all state agencies, and to provide leadership to ensure compatibility among those programs."

Clearly, state JTPA councils in these states (and perhaps others) are moving in directions that will position them to exercise leadership in all matters pertaining to education and training for employment, and federal policymakers and others may find it useful to observe their future progress as work continues.

NATIONAL COMMISSION FOR EMPLOYMENT POLICY
1522 K Street, NW, Suite 300
Washington, D.C. 20005

BEST COPY AVAILABLE